

REFLECTIONS

Upon the

ANSWER

To the PAPIST

Mis-represented, &c.

Directed to the

ANSWERER.

SIR, I have perus'd your *Answer*, and am glad to find it so moderate and calm: You make here and there some *Personal* reflections indeed; but this being done soberly, without heat and passion, I am still bound to thank you, if not on my particular, yet on the Publick score; For having by this convinc'd the world, that men of different judgments may now treat of matters of Controversie, without making use of Satyr and Scurrility, or letting Cavil fill up the place of Judgment and Reason. This method I cannot but approve as most agreeable to Christianity; And if I pursue the same, in giving a farther explication of some most material Points, you have been pleas'd to question in my small Treatise, as also in letting you know my farther sence of Yours; I hope it may be

A done

done without offence, and that the shortness I shall use, will be easily pardon'd, if it be but to the purpose.

Sir, You let me know, my First Character of a *Papist Mis-represented* is not satisfactory, as not founded on the sense of a Party, and the quotations of Authors, but being rather my own *False Apprehensions, my ignorant, my childish, or wilful mistakes*. Indeed had I been bred up in a Wood, and jump't forth into the world, with *this Character* in my head, I should have had reason to subscribe to you: But because, upon examination, I find I was educated in a well-peopled Town, at the foot of the Pulpit, and liv'd always in Company and Conversation, I cannot imagin this Character *so my own*, as you seem to understand it, but rather *my own, as I receiv'd it*. And you need not wonder that I did not heretofore, by the help of *Books or Friends*, receive better information, and correct my *false Apprehensions* of Popery. For indeed, were I even at *this time* to be rul'd by the greatest number of these, the Character of a *Papist* would be with me much blacker yet, than I have there drawn it. There would be, but few strokes of reason or Christianity in it, but *Beast and Barbarous* all over. And pray do you see Sir, what weighty proofs are urg'd against me, to shew how *foul and monstrous* a Religion I have chosen. They shew me the *Book of Homilies* laying a good foundation, Mr. Fox's Book of Martyrs, Bishop Ridley's Writings, The Publick Test, A Manual of three small Treatises, by John late Arch-Bishop of York, for the use of a Lady, to preserve her from the danger of Popery. Printed London 1672. Then a large Description given by Mr. Sutcliffe in his *Survey of Popery*,

Answer pag.

10, 11.

pag. 11.

To. 2. p.

46. 54. 213.

8cc.

Vol. 3. p. 515.

Popery, where he undertakes to draw its several features; as (*chap. 10.*) *That Popery is a sink of Heathenish Idolatry.* (*chap. 27.*) *That tis a most absurd and foolish Religion.* (*chap. 32.*) *That it is a Doctrine of Devils.* (*chap. 47.*) *That in many points 'tis more absurd and abominable than the Doctrine of Mahomet.* Then the *Anatomy of Popery* printed at London 1673. in which an Agreement is shown between *Paganism* and *Popery* in six and twenty Points; and with the *Jews* and *Pharisees* in other ten. Then Mr. *Julian Johnson* who has again set forth This Comparison of *Popery* and *Paganism*, especially as to *Politheism* and *Idolatry*; With the approbation of his *Answerer Jovian*, who assures him that *He, with all the rest that have so thundred of late with the Thebean Legion, like it well, and are as well satisfied with it, as he himself is, bating some irreverent Phrases.* Now Sir, amidst these *Authentick* proofs, besides a great number of other *Authors*, who undertake to draw *Popery* in its own *Colours*; what convenience or even possibility had I, of framing any better apprehension of *this Religion*, than was here laid before me: Especially since my *Friends* were not wanting to vouch the truth of all this, and to assure me; they had heard all this over and over from Men of *Character*, and in *Places*, which gave it reputation beyond all question? Neither does it appear to me, had it been my fortune to have consulted you in this affair, that I should have been much rectified as to these my *Childish* or *Wilful Mistakes* concerning *Popery*; as is evident from the *Character* you give of it throughout your *Answer*, and especially at the end (*pag. 161.*) viz. "That it is "that you can never yield to, without betraying the "truth, renouncing your senses and Reason, wound-

pag. 181.

pag. 99.

Jov. Introd.
pag. 4.

“ing your Conscience, dishonouring God, and his
 “Holy Word and Sacraments; perverting the doct-
 “rine of the Gospel, as to Christ’s satisfaction, Inter-
 “cession and Remission of sins; depriving the People
 “of the means of Salvation, which God himself hath
 “appointed, and the Primitive Church observ’d, and
 “damning those for whom Christ died.

But however I will not insist upon this point; Ile rather yeild, than be contentious: And because you say, that my Character of a *Papist Mis-represented*, is made up of *False Apprehensions, Ignorant, Childish and Wilful Mistakes*, Ile own it to be no better: But then, Sir, you must give me leave to make use of your *Authority* with my Friends and Acquaintance, in assuring them, that wheresoever they shall for the future either *bear*, or *read* such things charg’d upon the *Papists*, they must give it no credit, and esteem it no better, than the *False Apprehensions, Ignorant, Childish and Wilful Mistakes* of the Relatours. Upon this condition I close this point; only adding, that in laying down the Colours of a *Papist Mis-represented*, I never thought of declaring the Articles of your Church; or by *Mis-representing* the *Papist*, to represent you; as you seem to mistake me: But only to shew the many *Mistakes* and *Errours* to be found amongst *Protestants* of what kind soever, concerning the notion of *Popery*, for *Debitor sum sapientibus & Insipientibus*. And tho you seem willing in your *Introduction*, that your Reader should esteem this our complaint of being basely *Mis-represented*, no better than a meer *Pretence*, or a *Design of such who go about to deceive*, by comparing it with the Complaints of the *Arians, Pelagians, Nestorians, &c*, Yet we are beholding to you soon after; when finding some of
 the

pag. 9.

pag. 7.

pag. 9.

the dirt thrown at us, to fall upon *your own Face*, By your standing so *near us*, you then own it to be *grounded*, and *Real*, *pitying the Weakness and Folly* of those who Cast it (pag. 10.) And therefore I believe you will close with me in this Point, that Mis-representing is Mis-representing, tho from those who dissent from your Church. But we go on to the other Character of the *Papist represented*.

And this too, it seems, affords you as little satisfaction, as the former, on several accounts. And First you move a Scruple by the by, (pag. 9.) by your having no mind to ask, *How the Council of Trent should come to be the Rule and Measure of Doctrine to any here, where it was never received?* As if in *this Character* I had observ'd a *Rule*, which ought to be none *Here*, nor is own'd as *Such*. And as to this, I need only Inform you; that the Council of *Trent* is receiv'd here and all the Catholick World over, as to all its *Definitions of Faith*; altho it be not wholly receiv'd in some places, as to its other *Decrees*, which relate only to *Discipline*. And therefore in appealing to *this Council*, for the vindicating all I have *there* asserted, to be the Doctrine of *Catholicks*, I have done nothing but what I was oblig'd, and is justifiable before the whole World: and on the truth of what I have said concerning the *Councils* being universally receiv'd as to Doctrines of Faith, I'll allow the whole Cause between us to depend. But this only as to your *mistake*.

Now supposing this to be the *Rule* of such Points of Faith, as are there set down for the Belief of the *Papists*, you raise your Difficulty (pag. 11.) because *I shew no Authority I have to Interpret that Rule in my own sence*: it being a thing expressly forbidden by

Pius

Pius 4th. And because several of my *Representations* depend upon my own private Sence and Opinion. Truly Sir, had I, in undertaking to state the Belief of our Church, Interpreted the Council of *Trent* in my own private Sence, or Obtruded any Opinion of mine for an Article of our Faith, you might justly have Arraigned me at that Barr. But you must give me leave here to tell you, that you Wrong me, and Impose upon your Reader. For so far was I from committing this Fault of Interpreting the Council of *Trent* in my own Sence: That I have only deliver'd it, as it is Interpreted to me and to all our Church, in the *Catechism ad Parochos*, compos'd and set forth by Order of the said Council and *Pius 5th.* for the Instruction of the Faithful in their Christian Duty touching Faith and Good Manners, in conformity to the Sence of the Council. And for this reason in my Conclusion, I appeal'd to this *Catechism*, for the justifying of what I have represented to be the Faith of the *Papists*, to be really so. And that you may see, how vainly you have charged me with the Transgression of *Pope Pius's Bull*: remember I appeal'd again in my Conclusion to *Veron's Rule of Faith*, and to that set forth by the *Bishop of Condom*, for maintaining the Character of the *Papist Represented*, to be just. Now you must know the Latter of these, drew up a like Character in *Paris*, of the Belief of a *Papist*, and it being conform to the Principles of Piety and Christianity, it quite overthrew the foul charge of its Adversaries There, from their Books and Pulpits; and this so home, that they had no other way of preserving their Credit with their Flock, than to declare to them, that the Character set forth by the *Bishop* was not *Exact* and *True*; but only

pag. 172.

pag. 10.

ly vamped up by him into that Form for the Benefit of the Publick cause. Upon which he Published another Edition with several distinct attestations of many *Bishops* and *Cardinals*, and of the present *Pope* himself, wherein they at large approve the Doctrine contain'd in that Treatise, for the *Faith* and *Doctrine* of the *Church of Rome*, and conform to the Council of *Trent*. And now Sir, in proposing the *Faith* of our Church, as I found it deliver'd by this Reverend *Prelate*, and supported by such Authentick approbations, wherein have I Entrenched upon the Priviledge of the *Apostolick See*, of Interpreting the Council of *Trent*? Or what necessity of relying upon a *private Mans Judgment*, as you Phrase it, *of no Name, and no Authority*, instead of that of the *Pope* and *Council*? The *Faith* of a *Papist* I have deliver'd according to the *Catechism* Publish'd by Order of the *Council*, or as Explicated by a *Prelate*, who brings along with him the Authority of the *See Apostolick*; and which part of all this is my *private Sense or Opinion*?

But you offer to make good this charge in some Instances: As in the *Invocation of Saints*, I seem to limit their Power of helping us to *Prayers only*, which *Limitation* is not to be found in the Council of *Trent*. I cannot but acknowledge Sir, that the *Council* mentions their *Aid* and *Assistance*, which we may reasonably expect. But there being no other means, of their Aiding and Assisting us express'd in the Council, or in the *Catechism ad Parochos*, besides that of their *Prayers* to God to obtain benefits for us, through our only Saviour and Redeemer Jesus Christ. And it being thus limited by the *Bishop of Condom* on this Subject (pag. 33. Edit. Pa. 1681.) with the *Pope* and

and *Cardinal's* approbation; I think I need no farther vindication to shew, that in the proposall of that Point, I follow'd not my own *private sense* or *Opinion*, as you endeavour to prove.

In the Point of *Merit* you urge this again (pag. 56.) as if I had *qualified this Doctrine with the dependance on Grace, on God's goodness and Promise*, without the Authority of the *Council*; there being no such qualification express'd in *Can. 32.* read and cited by you. 'Tis true, 'tis not in this *Canon*. But if you please to look back to *Can. 26. Sex. 6.* you'll find it there clear enough to acquit me from the scandal of publishing my own *private sense* or *Opinion*.

You instance again (pag. 11.) in the Point of the *Popes personal Infallibility*, which I represent to be *no matter of Faith*: (pag. 42.) and what reason have you, you say, to adhere to my representation, rather than to that of many others, who assert the contrary? But this difficulty is nothing but your mistake: for I do not in the least deliver here my own private sentiment or opinion touching this point, in opposition to other Authors: But I only by way of Narrative relate, that whereas some Divines endeavour in their School debates to prove and maintain this *Personal Infallibility*, yet it is not receiv'd amongst *Catholicks* as any *matter of Faith*, because not positively determin'd by any *General Council*, and propos'd to the Faithful to be embrac'd as *such*. And this Sir again is not my private sense or Opinion, but a bare Narrative of matter of *Fact*.

But I am now to encounter your *Goliath-Argument*, which shews it self throughout your *Answer*, and seems to defy all the Hosts of *Israel*. If I can find never a Stone to sling at it, I must e'en lie at its mercy.

And

And it appears thus. In my Character of a *Papist* Represented I pretend to declare the *Faith* of a Roman Catholic, as 'tis defin'd and deliver'd in allow'd *General Councils* ; and yet tho the *Deposing Doctrine* has been as evidently declar'd in such Councils, as ever *Purgatory* and *Transubstantiation* were in that of *Trent*, yet still with me 'tis no *Article of our Faith*. This is the main strength of it, as urg'd by you on several occasions. pag. 12.
143.

I answer it in short ; that tho all *Doctrinal Points* defin'd in any approv'd *General Council*, and propos'd to the Faithful to be receiv'd under an *Anathema*, are with us so many *Articles of Faith*, and are obligatory to all of our Communion: Yet not so of every other matter declar'd in such a Council : There being many things treated of, and resolv'd on in such an Assembly, which concern not the Faith of the Church, but only some matter of *Discipline*, Government, or other more particular Affair. And these *Constitutions* or *Decrees* are not absolutely Obligatory, as is evident even in the Council of *Trent*, as is before hinted ; whose *Decrees of Doctrine* are as much acknowledg'd here by Catholics in *England* and *Germany*, as within the Walls of *Rome* it self, or the *Vatican* : And yet it's other *Constitutions* and *Decrees* are not universally receiv'd, and it may be never will. Now Sir, altho we allow some Councils have made decrees for deposing in particular Cases, yet the Power it self not being declar'd as a *Doctrinal Point* ; and the *Decrees* relating only to matter of *Discipline* and Government, it comes short of being an *Article* of our Faith, and all that in your Answer depends on it, falls to the Ground. I have no place here to give you a

B

distinct

distinct account of the several matters treated of in *Councils*, and of the difference between Decrees of *Faith*, and others which are not so; yet because you seem to require some satisfaction in these Points, I remit you to such Authors, who treat of them at large and most particularly the *Considerations upon the Council of Trent*, *Canus*, *Bellarmino* and others. This that I have here said may be sufficient to evince, that in my declaring the *deposing Power* to be *no Article of Faith*, I have not follow'd my own Private Opinion, or merely the *number* of Authors, but rather the sense of the *whole Church, Councils, and Popes* themselves, who plainly enough own this, in letting so many open and Positive Assertors of the *no-deposing Power*, to pass without any Censure of *Heresie*: It being certain that, were this Doctrine any *Article* of our *Faith*, as likewise that mention'd in the preceeding Paragraph, of the *Popes Personal Infallibility*, the obstinate Opposers of them would no more escape without *that brand*, than those that deny other *Articles* of our *Faith*, as *Purgatory* and *Transubstantiation*.

These Instances I look upon as the most Principal throughout your whole *Reply*, because in them you have made use of a *Medium* directly opposit to the *Intent* of my Book, and which if it had been effectual, would have shew'd, that I have not Represented the *Faith* of the *Papist* according to the *Rule* of approv'd General Councils, as I pretend; but rather according to my own private apprehension or Opinion; which I confess would have been a *full Answer* to it as to such particulars. But how far you have fail'd of your endeavours even in this Point, I leave now to the Prudent Considerer to judge. But the way you take
in

in all other Parts of your Book, seems to me not to answer your design, nor to agree with the *Title* of it. For whereas I undertake to propose the *Faith* of a *Roman Catholick*, as he is really taught to believe in Conformity to the Definitions of Oecumenical Councils: Bating those Points I have already spoke to, in your *Answer*,

You either own the Doctrine, to be the establish'd Belief of *your Church*, as in part that of the *Power of Priestly Absolution, Confession*, of due veneration to the *Relicks of Saints*, of *Merit*, of *Satisfaction*, of the *Authority of the Church*, of *General Councils*, &c.

Or you shew the Doctrine I have deliver'd, not to be the Faith of our Church, by appealing from the Definitions of our *Councils*, and *sense* of our *Church*, to some expressions found in Old *Mass books*, *Rituals* &c. as if this were a serious way of *truly Representing* the Doctrines of the *Church of Rome*. Can any *Religion* stand this *Test*? Will not many Expressions in all sorts of *Prayers, Preaching, and Devotions*, if separated from the *sense* of the *Church*, prove unjustifiable and Ridiculous? Let but an *Atheist* take this liberty even with the *Scripture* it self, and *thus* separate infinite number of expressions there, and see what will be presently the colour of *all Religion*, and whether *Christianity* will be better than *Turcism*: And especially whether the *allow'd Psalms* in *Meeter* will prove the devotion of men of *sence* and *reason*; tho all may be reconcileable to *Piety* and *Religion*, if taken in the *sense* of the *Church*.

Or you appeal again from the Declarations of our Councils, and *sense* of our *Church* to some *external Action*, as in case of respect shewn to *Images* and

pag. 21.

Saints, upon which from our *external Adoration*, by *construction of the Fact*, viz. *kneeling, bowing, &c.* you are willing to conclude us guilty of *Idolatry*: As if a true judgment could be made of *these Actions*, without respect to the *Intention* of the *Church*, that directs them, and of the *Person*, that does them. As if they were not in themselves *Indifferent*, and capable of being paid to *God*, or to *Men*. Or as if your measures being follow'd, *Abigail* ought not to come in, and share with us in our *constructive Idolatry*, because

1 Sam. 25. 24. *she fell before David on her face, and bow'd her self to the ground, and fell at his feet.* *Joshua* likewise, because he *fell on his face to the earth, and did worship the Angel*. And as many who on their knees pay their respects to the *King* and *bow* before him: As likewise all the *Beggars* in *Lincolns-Inn* fields, who on their knees, with their hands lifted up, ask an alms of *Passers-by*: Must not all these by *construction of Fact* come into the list of your *Idolaters*?

Jof. 5. 14.

Or finally, not being willing the *Doctrine* should pass for *ours*, in the form I have stated it, you appeal again from our *Councils* and *Sense* of the *Church*, which I follow, to the *Sentiments* of some of our own *Private Authors*, and so you come often with, this *French Author* says this, *Vives* says that, *Wicelius* says another thing, and *Lessius* another; by this method endeavouring to convince your Reader, that the *Belief* of a *Papist*, is much different from what I have represented it. But Sir, this way may do well enough with the unwary; but it ill suits with what you pretend. The *Frontis piece* of your Book puts us upon expecting *The Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome truly Represented*. And when we

we come to peruse it, we find several Doctrines propos'd, but without any Authority of *Church or Councils*, but *this Author says this*, and *that Author says that*; as if the Sense of every *Author*, were immediately the Doctrines; of our *Church*. The *Church* speaks to us in her approv'd *General Councils*, and from them you might have truly Represented her *Belief and Doctrine* but from particular *Authors*, some of which may Write upon a Pique, others upon a Passion, others upon some other Bias, nothing more can be Collected besides their own *Opinion*, and with understanding Men it passes for no more. So that nothing can be more unjustifiable, than to make a Collection of *private Mens sentiments*, and obtrude them for the truly Representing the Doctrines of the *Church* in whose Communion they are. And this is not the Case of our *Church* alone, there's no *Church* or Congregation in the World will stand this Test. And if it come a little home to you, it may be you will be more sensible of this truth. For altho you seem to maintain in your *Answer*, that good works of justified p. 57.
Persons are not Free; yet tis not just, this Doctrines should be immediately charg'd for the Belief of your *Church*. Altho Mr. *Thorndike* seems to allow *Prayers for the Dead*, yet neither from him are we to take a true representation of the Doctrines of his *Church*. Tho a worthy Divine declares, that in case a *Popish Julian* indeed should pag. 152.
Reign over us, he should Believe him incapable of Repentance, and upon that supposition should be tempted to pray for his Destruction; yet would it not be honest hence to blacken his *Church* with this Dis-loyal Principle, as if she allowed her *Members*, tho not to Fight against, yet to *Pray for the Destruction* of such a *Prince*. The like
may

Epil. 1. 3.
c. 5.

may be said of *King James* the *First* his holding Christ to be *truly present* in the *Sacrament*, and there also to be truly ador'd, maintaining in his Epistle to Cardinal *Perron* the Doctrine of the *Real Presence* to be the Doctrine of the Church of *England*: and again what the aforesaid Mr. *Thorndike* delivers of the same *Real Presence* and *Adoration* of Christ in the *Eucharist*, practis'd in the Antient Church from the beginning; and thereupon owning the *Eucharistical Sacrifice* to be truly the *Sacrifice* of Christ upon the *Cross*, in as much as the Body and Blood of Christ are contain'd in them; and then farther adding, that the Sacrifice of the *Cross* being necessarily Propitiatory and Impetratory both, it cannot be denied, that the Sacrament of the *Eucharist*, in as much as it is the same Sacrifice of Christ upon the *Cross*, is also both Propitiatory and Impetratory. Will you give me leave from hence to interr; that because these are the sentiments of such Eminent Persons in the Communion of the *Church of England*, that therefore they are the Doctrine of that Church, I suppose you will not; and therefore in the *true Representation* of the Doctrine of *yours* or *our* Church, I suppose, you will easily grant, that no appeal ought to be made to such *Private Authors*; but the Undertaker is oblig'd to keep close to the *sense* of either *Church*, declar'd in their *Councils* and *Decrees*, and as explicated by their Authority: And as far as you have effectually prov'd this against what I have represented for the Faith of a *Papist*, so so far will I allow you have given me a *just Answer*; And as much as you fail of this, so much you come short of what you undertake, which I recommend to your own perusal to examine.

But

But for any of these ways they are insignificant to your design, and deserve not to stand under the Title of an *Answer*. For how does your acknowledging our Doctrine to be yours: your producing some broken Expressions out of *Mass-Books*, your putting Objections from *external Actions*, from *private Authors*, or your *own Opinion*, any ways prove, that the Faith of a *Papist*, as I have represented it, is not according to the Council of *Trent*, and what really he is bound, as a *Papist*, to *Believe*? And yet this is the thing you ought to have prov'd, to make good your *Title*. But instead of this, you generally let your Reader understand, that I have indeed stated the matter aright, and only tell him, that you have something to say against the Doctrine, and do not like it. But your saying I hope (or if it could be proving) that *Catholicks* do not do well to *Believe*, as I *Represent*, is no Argument to prove that I do not *Represent well*. This as to the Representing the Doctrine of our Church.

I should say something to your concluding Argument which comes so home (*p. 14.*) I allow it seems, the *Orders of the Supream Pastor are to be obey'd, whether he be Infallible or no*. I confess likewise in another place, that *some Popes have own'd the Deposing Doctrine, and Acted according to it*. And here you infer, Therefore the *Papists* are bound by the Doctrine of their Church to Act, when the Popes shall require it, according to the Deposing Power. And does this *bring the matter home*? Why then Sir, you must ee'n give me leave to make another inference: That, What brings the matter home is nothing but an ordinary piece of Sophistry, and let the Reader judge.

judge. The Representer (*p. 42.*) speaking of the Popes Authority, says, that as in any Civil Government, the Sentence of the Supream Judge or Highest Tribunal is to be Obey'd, tho' there be no assurance of Infallibility or Divine Protection from Error or Mistake: So is he taught should be done to the Orders of the Supream Pastor, whether he be Infallible or no.

Where a Parallel is made between the Orders of *Popes* and *Civil Powers*, as to the *Obedience* due to them from their *Subjects*. Now Sir, if it be your Opinion that this Authority and Power in *these Supream Governours* is so *Absolute* and *Unconfined*, that like to *God* himself there can be no just exception made to any of their *Actions* or *Decrees*, whatsoever they be: then indeed your reasoning Answers your intent. But if the Case be possible, that these may *so* Act or Command, that the *not-following* or *not-obeying* in Inferiors may be *no Crime*; then you come but short of home, and prove just nothing. Now change but the *matter* of your Argument, and see how far it goes. The Orders of a *Prince*, being Supream Governour, are to be Obey'd, whether he be Infallible or no: But *some* Princes have done *thus* and *thus*; therefore the People by the Law are bound to Act *so* and *so*: Does this hold in *every* Action or Order of a Prince, without *Limit* or *Exception*? Tho' a Prince be to be obey'd, yet it follows not that his Word is the Law? So that whosoever takes this for a concluding Argument, must neither understand *Law* nor *Logick*.

I need not put the Reader in mind, how often you make your digressions amongst the *School-men*, and leave not scouting among them, till you have lost the matter in hand: And dispute about their *Opinions*, instead

stead of matter of *Faith*; how in the Point of *dispensations*, where we speak of the *Moral Law*; and assert the *Pope* cannot dispense with it, as give leave to break the *Commandments*, to *lye or for-swear*: You shew your learning, in proving he can dispense with *other Laws and Positive Institutions*, a thing scarce to be doubted of, and nothing to our purpose. He say nothing of the admirable close of Your Chapter of *Dispensations*, in which tho you have not produc'd one proof of *Dispensations*, for *lying or for swearing* being allow'd in our Church on any account whatsoever, you yet give this assurance to your Reader; *We know this Dispensing Power is to be kept up as a great Mystery, and not to be made use of, but upon weighty and urgent Causes — as their Doctrines declare.* Where certainly one proof of the *Who*, the *Where* and the *When*, had been much more Satisfactory, than the Positive *We know*, and *Their Doctrines declare*: For tho many are willing to take this upon trust, yet it would have gone farther, if you had prov'd it down right, without taking Sanctuary in a *Mystery*. He pass by your dexterity wherewith you have manag'd the History of *St. Perpetua* in the Chap. of *Purgatory*: Where after you have disguis'd it to your purpose in the Relation, and drol'd the *Vision* of a *Martyr*, and so esteem'd by *St. Augustin*, into a young Ladies *Dream*, you at last set it forth for the *Foundation* of our Churches Doctrine, and would perswade your Reader, that Our Tenent of *Purgatory* is *built* upon it; when 'tis us'd by me for no more, than a *Marginal Citation*, amongst several others: And yet this is our *Foundation*, and our Doctrine is *built* on it: Here I fear, you had forgot your promise made in the

pag. 117.

pag. 9.

beginning of being *sincere*, and using no *Tricks*. But I forbear,

And will only conclude, that if you have *truly represented the Doctrines of the Church of Rome*, I would as soon be a *Turk* as your *Papist*; whose character you have drawn at large throughout your Book, and in little in pag. 161. which, however you may call *truly Representing*, I can look upon no better than *truly Mis-representing*. And by what I see, I think I might with as good reason go to a *Pharisee*, to be inform'd of *Christ*, and receive the Character of a *Christian* from a *Mahometan*; as come to you, to know what a *Papist* is, what his *Belief* and *Doctrine*. Neither do I wonder, that you come thus wide of what you pretend to: The method you take, would bring a Scandal even upon the *Apostles* themselves, and render the *Church* of those purer times, of the same colour with *ours*. Observe but the *same*, in drawing the Features of *your own Church*, and then tell me whether this be the way of *truly representing*. If a man were but to bring into publick your *School-debates*, the *differing Opinions* of your own Authors, concerning the *Scriptures*, *Predestination*, *Freewill*, the *Authority of the Church*, the *Reformation*, *Traditions*, &c. all expressions of *Sermons*, *Prayers*, &c. and out of these, and all others of this kind, pick out and patch up a *Religion* according to the best contrivance of the Undertaker, and then shew it forth to the world, do you think, this would be *yours truly represented*? Why then must such another *Jumble* as this be exposed to the World for *ours*? If you'll let your Flock see what our Religion is, send them to the *Council of Trent*, the *Catechism*
ad

ad Parochos, this wee'l own and stand by : But for you to pick here a bit and there a bit, to patch as you please, to make your Inferences and Applications at pleasure, and then to tell your Reader, these are the Doctrines of the *Church of Rome truly Represented*; this is to abuse the World and your selves, and to render us Infamous for principles which are nothing of *our Religion*. And in Case you do not judge what I have here said sufficient to convince you, that the *Faith*, as I have *Represented* it, is really the Faith of a *Papist*, I'll be content all these Reasons at present pass for nought; and that the decision of this whole affair depend upon an *Experience*. Do but you, or any Friend for you) give your Assent to those Articles of Faith, in the very form and manner, as I have stated them, in the Character of the *Papist Represented*; and if upon request, you are not admitted into the Communion of the *Roman Catholicks*, and own'd to Believe *aright* in all those Points, I'll then Confess, that I have abus'd the World, that my *Representing* is *Mis-representing* the Faith of a *Papist*, and that my design has been not to undeceive, but to deceive the People. But if on the contrary it shall appear, that the Faith, as I have Represented it, is the approv'd Doctrine of that Church, and sufficient for any one to be receiv'd a Member of it, I may then justly renew my Complaint of its being *Mis-represented*, that the Religion of the *Papist* is nothing like what 'tis commonly render'd; and that 'tis a hard fate, that the Professors of it should be so injur'd in their Reputation, and by this means become so *Odious*, that even amongst Fellow-Christians, *Atheists*, and *Jews*, shall be tolerated with less regret than they.